

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This reply is in response to the Final Office Action dated June 29, 2007. Claims 1-49, 58-70 and 75-91 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Applicant cancelled claims 1-91 in this amendment and presented new claims 92-104.

Such amendment does not add new matter and is supported, *inter alia*, in paragraphs [0006]-[0021], [0037]-[0038], [0048]-[0077] and [0118]-[0120] of the application as filed. Entry of the foregoing amendment and reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the interview conducted October 12, 2007. Included herein are amendments to the claims in line with those discussed during the interview.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in light of Weng et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,225,432; hereafter “Weng”). Applicant respectfully submits that, in light of the current amendments, Weng no longer renders Applicant’s claims obvious.

Applicant has amended this application to reflect claims directed to various processes for production of branched crystalline polypropylenes and branched crystalline polypropylene compositions. As it is not believed that Weng discloses all of the elements of Applicant’s now pending process claims, including, but not limited to,

- (a) unimodal weight distribution of the branched crystalline polypropylene polymer;
- (b) diluent concentration in the polymerization medium (Weng discloses “at least 25 weight percent” diluent, *see* Weng 10:56-62); and
- (c) incorporation of polypropylene macromers made by the first metallocene catalyst compound into the crystalline polypropylene made by the second metallocene catalyst compound.

It is, therefore, respectfully submitted that Weng does not render Applicant's now pending claims obvious. MPEP §2143.03 ("To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.").

Further, it should be noted, that in Weng, it is disclosed that the concentration of propylene monomers in the polymerization medium should be less than 25, more preferably less than 20, still more preferably less than 15 weight percent of the polymerization medium. *See* Weng, 11:3-10. It is submitted that such a low concentration of propylene monomers would not permit the operation of the process claimed herein, in that the first metallocene would not be able to produce sufficient quantity of polypropylene macromer (specifically vinyl terminated macromer) such that the later step of incorporation of the macromer into the crystalline polypropylene produced by the second metallocene catalyst compound could occur. The lack of sufficient macromer for incorporation would lead Weng to produce a polypropylene that would not resemble the unique crystalline branched polypropylenes made by Applicants' process.

USSN: 10/683,593
Attorney Docket No. 2002B147/2
Reply to Office Action dated June 29, 2007
Amendment dated October 23, 2007

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all objections and rejections having been overcome and this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request early and favorable reconsideration in the form of a Notice of Allowance.

If necessary to affect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to affect a timely response. Please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1712 (Docket #: 2002B147/2).

Respectfully submitted,

October 23, 2007

Date

/Kevin M. Faulkner/

Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 45,427

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):
ExxonMobil Chemical Company
Law Technology
P.O. Box 2149
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149
Telephone No. (281) 834-5933
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495